

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**Manuscript NO:** 52980

**Title:** Glargine-300: An updated literature review on randomized controlled trials and real-world studies

**Reviewer's code:** 03465354

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Author's country:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-11-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-27 14:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-12-30 16:10

**Review time:** 3 Days and 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The aim of the proposed review manuscript by Ghosh and Ghosh was to summarize the result of randomized clinical trials and real-world studies on the clinical efficiency and safety information on the second-generation basal insulin analogue glargine 300 U/ml (Gla-300) in patients with type 1 and 2 diabetes. Specific comments and recommendations: - The authors should re-formulate the title of the manuscript to represent the aim of the review. - In my opinion, Figure 1 is not needed, but it is entirely up to the authors' consideration. - When discussing various studies, the authors are not always specific on the demographics and the clinical characteristics of the individuals involved in these studies. This missing information to be included. Beside these minor comments, in my opinion, the review is in a good shape.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**Manuscript NO:** 52980

**Title:** Glargine-300: An updated literature review on randomized controlled trials and real-world studies

**Reviewer's code:** 03490863

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DSc, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Russia

**Author's country:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-11-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-27 09:36

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-01-03 04:39

**Review time:** 6 Days and 19 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The manuscript describes the advantages of insulin glargin-300 over other basal insulins in the treatment of type 1 and type 2 diabetes. The topic of the review is relevant for clinicians involved in diabetes management. The review presents the latest results of randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and real-world evidence (RWE) studies of glargine-300. In general, the review adequately reflects the state of research in this area. The manuscript is written very clearly and consistently..From my point of view, the article can be published after some revision.

1. Abstract is not very informative, as it does not contain new information. I would include a summary of specific data from RCTs and RWE studies.
2. Core tips. The following phrase should be specified: "Glargine-300 (Gla-300), the second-generation long-acting insulin analogue, provides an extended and stable action profile, sustained glucose lowering, reduced risk of hypoglycaemia, less weight gain, and flexibility of dosing schedule". Advantages in comparison with what are meant here? The effect on body weight should be verified, since most studies have not shown such an advantage.
3. The methodology for searching and selecting information for review should be described.
4. The differences in the RCTs of insulin glargin-300 and degludec (BRIGHT and CONCLUDE) regarding the study design (first of all, inclusion criteria) and patient populations should be described in more detail.
5. BRIGHT: it should be clarified to what period of the study the data in the last paragraph ("The event rates of hypoglycaemia ( $\leq 70$  mg/dl) were lower with Gla-300...") refers.
6. The results of the studies comparing glargin-300 and degludec with the use of CGM: type of diabetes should be mentioned.
7. Table 2. EDITION 3 study. The data look inconsistent: the figure 1.0% should be checked.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

*Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

*BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No